

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

RECEIVED

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To:
ARTHUR S. GARRETT
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.
1300 I STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3315

PCT

JUL - 8 2004

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW

WRITTEN OPINION GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP

(PCT Rule 66)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 8049.922-304		Date of Mailing (day/month/year) 06 JUL 2004
International application No. PCT/US03/23984		REPLY DUE within 2 months/days from the above date of mailing Priority date (day/month/year) 29 August 2002 (29.08.2002)
International filing date (day/month/year) 01 August 2003 (01.08.2003)		
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC(7): G06F 17/60 and US Cl.: 705/35, 406, 407, 408		
Applicant UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE		

- This written opinion is the first (first, etc.) drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.
- This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:
 - ☒ Basis of the opinion
 - ☐ Priority
 - ☐ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
 - ☐ Lack of unity of invention
 - ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2 (a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
 - ☐ Certain documents cited
 - ☐ Certain defects in the international application
 - ☐ Certain observations on the international application
- The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.

When? See the time limit indicated above. ~~The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension. See rule 66.2(d).~~

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 *bis*.
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.
- The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 29 December 2004 (29.12.2004).

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: IPEA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450	Authorized officer <i>P. Vope</i> Vincent Millin Telephone No. (703) 306-1113
Facsimile No.	

Form PCT/IPEA/408 (cover sheet) (July 1998)

✓ 705

I. Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the elements of the international application:*

- ☒ the international application as originally filed
- ☒ the description:
pages 1-19 _____, as originally filed
pages NONE _____, filed with the demand
pages NONE _____, filed with the letter of _____
- ☒ the claims:
pages 20-35 _____, as originally filed
pages NONE _____, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
pages NONE _____, filed with the demand
pages NONE _____, filed with the letter of _____
- ☒ the drawings:
pages 1-5 _____, as originally filed
pages NONE _____, filed with the demand
pages NONE _____, filed with the letter of _____
- ☐ the sequence listing part of the description:
pages NONE _____, as originally filed
pages NONE _____, filed with the demand
pages NONE _____, filed with the letter of _____

2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- ☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the written opinion was drawn on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☐ contained in the international application in printed form.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☐ the description, pages NONE _____
- ☐ the claims, Nos. NONE _____
- ☐ the drawings, sheets/fig NONE _____

5. ☐ This opinion has been drawn as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed."

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.
PCT/US03/23984

V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. STATEMENT

Novelty (N)	Claims <u>NONE</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-92</u>	NO
Inventive Step (IS)	Claims <u>NONE</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-92</u>	NO
Industrial Applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1-92</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO

2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

Claims 1-92 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Pintsov et al. U.S. Patent 6,385,504 in view of Gilham U.S. Patent 5,774,554

Pintsov teaches a method for providing a verifiable delivery payment coding comprising: transmitting verification data configured to be included in a delivery payment coding; receiving an item in an item delivery system, the item comprising the delivery payment coding including the verification data; and verifying the authenticity of the delivery payment coding using verification data (column 3, lines 10-67). The verification data is machine-readable and is optically able to be scanned from the address label (Figure 6). Pintsov fails to teach that the delivery verification is associated with a monetary value. Gilham teaches associating a monetary value with the delivery payment coding (column 3, line 46 thru column 4, line 55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Pintsov to include associating monetary value with payment coding as taught by Gilham because it provides an efficient criteria for verifying delivery payment. There is sufficient motivation to combine the teachings of Pintsov and Gilham because both teach a method for providing a verifiable delivery payment coding with verification data to be included in a delivery payment coding.

Claims 1-92 meets the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus has industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

TIME LIMIT:

The time limit set for response to a Written Opinion may not be extended. 37 CFR 1.484(d). Any response received after the expiration of the time limit set in the Written Opinion will not be considered in preparing the International Preliminary Examination Report.